Timothy D. Shea, WSBA #39631 1 The Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez tshea@wshblaw.com 2 WOOD, SMITH, HENNING & BERMAN LLP 520 Pike Street, Suite 1525 3 Seattle, Washington 98101-4001 Phone 206-204-6800 Fax 206-299-0400 4 Attorneys for Defendant 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 AT SEATTLE KENNETH MACIORA. 10 Civil Action No. 16-CV-00295RSM Plaintiff. 11 ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT 12 v. 13 PMB HELIN DONOVAN, CHRISTINE CARDWELL and DONALD MCPHEE, 14 Defendants. 15 16 COME NOW the defendants, PMB Helin Donovan, Christie Cardwell and Donald 17 McPhee, through the undersigned counsel, and answer Plaintiff's Amended Complaint as 18 follows. 19 1.1 In answer to paragraph 1 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants deny the same. 20 1.2 In answer to paragraph 2 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants deny the same. 21 1.3 In answer to paragraph 3 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants admit that they 22 signed an auditor opinion dated April 7, 2015. Defendants admit that Ms. Cardwell was 23 contacted by a former MyECheck employee on or about August 26, 2015. Defendants deny all 24 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Amended Complaint. 25 1.4 In answer to paragraph 4 of the Amended Complaint, the Form 10 speaks for ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO WOOD, SMITH, HENNING & BERMAN LLP

PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT - 1

(16-CV-00295RSM)

520 Pike Street, Suite 1525

Seattle, Washington 98101-4001

206-204-6800

itself. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Amended Complaint.

1.5 In answer to paragraph 5 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants deny the same.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2.1 In answer to paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants deny that plaintiff has asserted, or has, a factually and/or legally sufficient claim arising under the Exchange or Securities Act. Defendants admit that jurisdiction and venue in this court are proper.

DEFENDANTS

3.1 In answer to paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of the Amended Complaint, information contained on Defendants' website speaks for itself. Defendants admit that it is a LLP with offices across the United States, including in Seattle, WA, and that it has employees and partners. Defendants admit that the second paragraph of paragraph 8 identifies some of the partners of Defendant PMB. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 9 and 10. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 8, and to the extent not admitted to herein, the remaining allegations of paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Amended Complaint, putting the plaintiff to his proof.

ALLEGATIONS: "THE SCHEME"

- 4.1 Paragraph 11 of the Amended Complaint is a statement of the plaintiff's position, and states a legal conclusion, requiring no answer.
- 4.2 Paragraph 12 of the Amended Complaint is a statement of the plaintiff's position, and states a legal conclusion, requiring no answer. To the extent an answer is required, Defendants admit that it performed some audit functions for MyECheck. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Amended Complaint, putting the plaintiff to his proof.

16 of the Amended Complaint.

25

	4.22	In answer to paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint, the first, second and third
senten	ces state	or seek a legation requiring no answer. Defendants deny the remaining
allegat	ions of	paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint.

- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the Amended
- Defendants deny the allegations contained within paragraph/heading "C" on page
- In answer to paragraph 32 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants admit to receiving an email on August 22, 2015, defendants deny that such email attached valid employment agreements. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 32
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 33 of the Amended
- Defendants deny the allegations contained within paragraph/heading "D" on page
- In answer to paragraph 34 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants admit to receiving an email on August 22, 2015, defendants deny that such email attached valid employment agreements. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 34
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the Amended

Violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act of 1934

5.1 In answer to the first sentence of paragraph 36 of the Amended Complaint,

Defendants reallege, as if set forth herein, all of there answers to all preceding paragraphs of the Amended Complaint, including specifically paragraphs 1-35. The remaining sentences of paragraph 36 state and/or seek a legal conclusion, requiring no response. Defendants deny any allegations that may be asserted against them in paragraph 36.

- 5.2 In answer to paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants admit that they audited the financial statements prepared by the Company, and that Defendants compiled and signed an independent audit report, and that they met the requisite standard of care. To the extent not specifically admitted to herein, Defendants deny all remaining allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint.
- 5.3 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the Amended Complaint.

SECOND CLAIM

Aiding and Abetting MyECheck's Violations of Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act of 1934

- 5.4 In answer to paragraph 39 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants reallege, as if set forth herein, all of there answers to all preceding paragraphs of the Amended Complaint, including specifically paragraphs 1-38.
- 5.5 In answer to paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants admit that they audited the financial statements prepared by the Company, and that Defendants compiled and signed an independent audit report. The third sentence of paragraph 40 is a statement of the plaintiff's position requiring no response. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint.
- 5.6 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Amended Complaint.

19

THIRD CLAIM

Violation of Section 10(a) of the Exchange Act of 1934

- 5.7 In answer to paragraph 42 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants reallege, as if set forth herein, all of there answers to all preceding paragraphs of the Amended Complaint, including specifically paragraphs 1-41.
- 5.8 The allegations contained in 43 of the Amended Complaint state and/or seek a legal conclusion, requiring no response. Defendants deny any allegations that may be asserted against them in paragraph 43.
- 5.9 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 44 of the Amended Complaint.
- 5.10 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 45 of the Amended Complaint.

FOURTH CLAIM

Aiding and Abetting Violations of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Exchange Act Rules 13a-1, 13a-13 and 12b-20

- 5.11 In answer to paragraph 46 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants reallege, as if set forth herein, all of there answers to all preceding paragraphs of the Amended Complaint, including specifically paragraphs 1-45.
- 5.12 The allegations contained in 47 of the Amended Complaint state and/or seek a legal conclusion, requiring no response. Defendants deny any allegations that may be asserted against them in paragraph 47.
- 5.13 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 48 of the Amended Complaint.

24

25

FIFTH CLAIM

Aiding and Abetting Violations of Section 13(b) of the Exchange Act of 1934 and Securities Act Rule 13b2-1

- 5.14 In answer to paragraph 49 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants reallege, as if set forth herein, all of there answers to all preceding paragraphs of the Amended Complaint, including specifically paragraphs 1-48.
- 5.15 The allegations contained in 50 of the Amended Complaint state and/or seek a legal conclusion, requiring no response. Defendants deny any allegations that may be asserted against them in paragraph 50.
- 5.16 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 51 of the Amended Complaint.

SIXTH CLAIM

Negligence

- 5.17 In answer to paragraph 52 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants reallege, as if set forth herein, all of there answers to all preceding paragraphs of the Amended Complaint, including specifically paragraphs 1-51.
- 5.18 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 53 of the Amended Complaint.
- 5.19 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 54 of the Amended Complaint.
- 5.20 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 55 of the Amended Complaint.
- 5.21 Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 56 of the Amended Complaint.
 - 5.22 The allegations contained within the plaintiff's "Prayer for Relief" constitute a

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 2 I hereby certify that on April 1, 2016, I electronically filed this Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF. 3 4 I hereby certify that the following has been served via U.S. Mail: Kenneth Maciora 5 72 Adelhaide Lane 6 East Islip, NY 11730 DATED this 1st day of April, 2016. 7 8 9 10 rfaulds@wshblaw.com Legal Assistant LEGAL:05488-0528/5546070.1 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 **20** 21 22 23

24

25